REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 – 7, 10 – 12, and 18 – 21 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claim 11 was rejected for reciting "the personal weblog". The Office Action states there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The Applicants disagree. "The personal weblog" refers back to "a personal weblog" as recited in line 1 of Claim 11.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1 – 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is argued in pages 4 – 6 of the Office Action that Claims 1 – 7 are not tied to a particular machine or apparatus. Claim 1 has been amended to include the step of "displaying the entry on a display device." The Applicants therefore respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

1.   Claims 1 – 7, 10 - 12, and 13 – 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Microsoft Project 2000 as evidenced by Pyron et al., Using Microsoft Project

2000 (2000; MS Project) in view of Clark, U,S, Patent No. 7,062, 449. This rejection is

traversed, as MS Project and Clark, taken together or in part, fail to teach or suggest the

Applicants' invention as now claimed.

The Applicants' invention as now set forth in exemplary claim 1 includes a method for

tracking the status of a workflow. The method includes the steps of:

> "instantiating an instance of a workflow by a user, the user being assigned to a
> role in the workflow, the workflow having a plurality of workflow steps <u>executing within
> a first application;</u>
> <u>generating a weblog to track an instance of the workflow, the weblog being a
> second application executing separately from the first application,</u> the weblog accessible
> to weblog members, first weblog members with permission to view workflow status and
> weblog comments, and second weblog members with permission to view workflow status
> and view and post weblog comments; and
> <u>causing communication between the workflow application and the weblog
> application to automatically post an entry in the weblog to indicate that a workflow action
> has occurred,</u> the entry being physically viewable on a display device by weblog
> members<u>:</u>
> displaying the entry on a display device."

An example implementation of the Applicants' invention as set forth at Applicants' Specification at [00028] helps understand the claimed invention. In this example, the workflow involves processes associated with the delivery of cars at a car dealership. "The workflow includes various steps or actions to be performed such as financing approval, inventory tracking, receiving the car, selling the car, servicing the car, and a means to handle exceptions or actions not described within the workflow." A user, such as Lucy James or another person (Fig. 2, 3) can instantiate a car receiving workflow. It is desirable to provide a way to communicate the actions taken in association with these steps in the workflow – receiving the car, servicing the car, etc. – to people who are interested in it. In this example, the workflow is part of the first application.

Thus, in accordance with the invention, Lucy James, or another person such as Lew Gould (Fig. 4) can also generate a weblog that tracks that workflow. The weblog is accessible to weblog members who are interested in the status of the workflow. In accordance with the invention, first weblog members can view workflow status and weblog comments and second weblog members can view status and post weblog comments. Weblog members can be both first and second weblog members, or, in accordance with certain embodiments, may be first weblog members only for policy reasons. For example, Lucy, as a user, can view the workflow status of any of the workflows she has initiated (Fig. 2). Thus, Lucy is a first weblog member. If, for example she has proper permission, Lucy can also post comments on the weblog. Thus, Lucy is also a second weblog member. In accordance with an embodiment, Lew Gould (Fig. 4), as General Manager, may not have actually instantiated any car receiving workflows but is a weblog member that can view them. If policy provides that second weblog members have certain permissions, he may also be a second weblog member who can both view and post

comments if he has proper authorization.   In this example, the weblog is the second application, and it is executed separately from the first application.

In accordance with the invention, communication is caused between the workflow (first) application and the weblog (second) application to automatically post an entry in the weblog to indicate that a workflow action has occurred, the entry being physically viewable on a display device by weblog members.   Thus, as actions occur in Lucy's car receiving workflow, her weblog is automatically updated.   Lucy, as at least a first weblog member, can view this update.   Lucy does not need to physically update the weblog that is tracking the workflow, she may not even have the ability to post comments – but the weblog will be updated automatically when her workflow actions occur.   Furthermore, Lou's weblog (second application) is automatically updated, even though he may not even be participating in the workflow (first application).

Thus the Applicants have provided a way to link actions occurring in a workflow application to a physically viewable but separate weblog application, viewable by the users of the workflow and/or the members of the weblog.   In accordance with a particular embodiment of the claimed application, as explained at Applicants' specification at [00021], each workflow instance communicates with its respective weblog through an interpreter.   (Fig 2.)   More specifically, "Processing by the interpreter 58 includes translating raw events triggered in the workflow instance 50 into an XML weblog entry format or other standard weblog entry format that is human readable." [00022]

The Applicants respectfully submit that MS Project and Clark, taken in any combination or part, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as now claimed.   The invention as now claimed requires that a workflow be instantiated by a user, the workflow having a plurality of workflow steps executing within a first application.   In addition, a weblog is generated, the weblog being a second application executing separately from the first application, the weblog

accessible by weblog members, who may or may not be participants in the workflow being viewed. This weblog can be viewed by some ("first weblog members") and posted to by others ("second weblog members"). Weblog members may be first and/or second weblog members. An application enables communication between the workflow and the weblog to automatically post entries to the weblog when a workflow action has occurred. Note that a user of the workflow need not have the capability to post to the weblog, it will be automatically updated when his/her actions on a workflow step occur. Likewise, the user of the weblog need not have the capability to update with workflow, he can monitor the workflow via the weblog, since they are separate applications.

The updates referred to in MS Project are updates made manually by workflow users themselves. MS Project does not contemplate a separate weblog for weblog members wherein a weblog that is a separate application is automatically updated when a workflow action occurs. To use the features of MS Project, you must be executing MS Project. The "tracking" features referred to in the Office Actions are all features of the same application. Clark only tracks its own internal workflow. So, no combination of these references can teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as now claimed including the steps of "instantiating an instance of a workflow by a user, the user being assigned to a role in the workflow, the workflow having a plurality of workflow steps executing within a first application; generating a weblog to track an instance of the workflow, the weblog being a second application executing separately from the first application, the weblog accessible to weblog members, first weblog members with permission to view workflow status and weblog comments, and second weblog members with permission to view workflow status and view and post weblog comments; and causing communication between the workflow application and the weblog application to automatically post an entry in the weblog to indicate that a workflow action has occurred, the entry being physically viewable on a display device by weblog members."

The Office Action also states that "is was known at the time of the invention that merely providing an automatic means to replace a manual activity which accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art, In re Venner… but Applicants are not simply automating the step of "posting an entry … to indicate that a workflow action has occurred … giving you just what you would expect from the manual step as shown in MS Project. Again, this is because the Applicant claims posting an entry to a weblog which is a different application having different members, and claims doing so automatically. This is clearly not a matter of a combination of automatic means of replacing manual activitiy.

The Office Action further states that "Official Notice is taken that it is old and very well known to enable varying levels of permissions, privileges, authorizations and/or access to various groups (roles) of weblog members (e.g. readers vs. authors, blog members vs. owners, etc.). As evidenced by a list of references. Official Notice is hereby traversed. The Applicants stipulate that the references state what the references state and that is all. The Applicants do not concede that any reference teaches what the Office Actions states which is, that is old and very well known to "enable varying levels of permissions, privileges, authorizations and/or access to various groups (roles) of weblog members (e.g. readers vs. authors, blog members vs. owners, etc.)." The statement is overly broad and the Applicants cannot concede that the cited referenced support it.

For all the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2 – 7 are in condition for allowance. Independent Claims 10 and 18 contain limitations similar to that of Claim 1; therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 10 – 12, and 18 - 21 are also in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claim(s) 1, 10, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The above recited claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwanke, U.S. patent Publication No. 2003/008508 (sic) in view of Udell, Telling a Story (2001) and further in view of Doctorow et al., Essential Blogging (2002). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Schwanke teaches a data-triggered workflow engine (Schwanke, Abstract). Nowhere in Scwhanke is the use of weblogs recited. The Office Action admits that Schwanke does not teach communication between the workflow and "the weblog" to automatically post and entry in the weblog. Of course Schwanke can't teach that because there is no second application, or weblog, mentioned in Schwanke.

The Office Action then offers that Udell "teaches an application (to cause communication between the workflow (project) and the weblog to automatically post an entry in the weblog to indicate that a workflow action has occurred"). The Applicants disagree with this characterization of Udell. Udell speaks of what a weblog can produce – not what it might be automatically triggered to produce. Udell does not suggest that a weblog should be used as a second application for automatically posting entries that indicate that actions have occurred in a first application, as claimed.

Finally, the Office Action points out that neither Schwanke nor Udell expressly teach managing weblog permissions as claimed. The Office Action states that Doctorow teaches weblog accessibility. But Doctorow adds nothing further to Schwanke or Udell to solve their deficiencies. Schwank, Udell, and Doctorow, taken apart or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention wherein instantiating an instance of a workflow by a user, the user being assigned to a role in the workflow, the workflow having a plurality of workflow steps executing within a first application; generating a weblog to track an instance of the workflow, the weblog being a second application executing separately from the first

<u>application</u>, the weblog accessible to weblog members, first weblog members with permission to view workflow status and weblog comments, and second weblog members with permission to view workflow status and view and post weblog comments; and <u>causing communication between the workflow application and the weblog application to automatically post an entry in the weblog to indicate that a workflow action has occurred</u>, the entry being physically viewable on a display device by weblog members…".

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant(s) submit(s) that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 12-2158.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 26, 2010   /Mary Steubing/ _____
Reg. No. 37,946   Mary Steubing
                                        Attorney for Applicant(s)
                                        Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
                                        5 Mount Royal Avenue
Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003   Mount Royal Office Park
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005   Marlborough, MA 01752